THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. I. NEW SERIES. NO. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1950

COMMENTS AND NOTES

IN the early summer of this year the world of Byzantine scholarship suffered a heavy loss, in many ways irreparable, by the death of Professor Dr. Thomas Whittemore, Director of the Byzantine Institute of Boston and Paris, and engaged for nearly twenty years on the work of uncovering and preserving the incomparable mosaics of the Christian churches of Constantinople, and in particular of the Church of the Holy Wisdom. Professor Whittemore had a wide circle of friends in America and Europe, indeed there was hardly a distinguished scholar and person of note that was not included in that circle. His literary output was small, but to the discerning his annual report of work was recognized to be of rare quality. He brought to his work the passionate zest and wide knowledge of a lifetime. Nor were those characteristics merely archæological, but vivified by the deep Christian piety of a faithful son of the Church. It may be justly said that no single man has done more to place in its right perspective the contribution of Byzantine art to the civilization of the world. To those who have had the privilege of seeing through his eyes the splendour of the mosaics of the imperial entrance to the Church of the Holy Wisdom, the Panagia, and the glittering and resplendent archangel of the Holy Bema and the Panagia of the Apse, the imperial portraits of the Galleries, the ikons of the saints on the northern Tympanum, a sense of the supreme importance and achievement of the architecture of the Justinian age and of the art of post-ikonoclast Byzantium has been revealed. It will be difficult to find his successor. May he rest in peace.

It is hardly within our province to do more than comment on the situation that has arisen as a result of the decision of His Holiness the Pope of Rome to elevate to a dogma the doctrine of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ. From our point of view, we share the deep misgiving of many outside the Roman Communion at this decision which will inevitably make the mutual approach of Christians more difficult at this critical time. But the Roman Communion is to-day a vast world in itself of some hundreds of millions of mankind. It cannot be easy for Roman Catholics with their strongly centralized government and their substantial agreement on this matter to assess the full impact of the pronouncement on Christendom generally.

It is interesting to note, however, that the general discussion of the subject has made apparent the loose hold of many religious people on the

Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body. While we may doubt the historical evidence for the Assumption from the beginning and remember the many illustrious names who have been unable to subscribe to that evidence as forming the basis for a fully articulated dogma, there is nothing contrary to the faith of the undivided Church in believing that as Christ the First-fruits was raised from the dead and in His risen and transfigured body ascended into heaven, so also the Christian after the general judgment and resurrection is capable, through incorporation in Him, of being so raised and glorified in that unity and perfection of body and soul that constitutes the fullness of human personality and the divine purpose for it. The doctrine of the bodily Assumption of our Lady implies that for her the general judgment resurrection and her "partaking of the divine nature" has been anticipated. Whether we believe this to be so is a separate problem, but we venture to emphasize that granted these theologically *à priori* grounds (which are surely Evangelical) the doctrine does not go beyond the implications of a primary belief, sadly obscured by the increasing rationalization of the mysteries of our Redemption.

We are greatly beholden to an article entitled "The Dialogue of Amsterdam" contributed by Dom Clement Lialine, O.S.B., in the current issue of *Eirénikon*. He points out (among many other important considerations) the important change that has come over the attitude of the Amsterdam Assembly towards the resolution of differences in Christian outlook of its members. It is reasonable that the first enthusiasm of eirenic meetings between varied traditions should issue in an attempt to find, and feel a joy in finding, a substantial common denominator. This seems to have been the temper of the early Edinburgh meetings. Further exploring has since made it clear that a more valuable method is indicated by the use of a dialectic of differences: that a richer knowledge and understanding results from an outspoken and sincere expression of faith as held by apparently opposing points of view, by systems of belief that have often taken shape independently and without apparent reciprocal contact. It is clear, however, that underlying this courageous attitude, there is the assumption not only of a primary common ground (faith, for example, in our Lord as Saviour and God) but an equally firm conviction that differences however stark can and will be ultimately resolved. It is understandable that there are some who are sceptical of both these convictions; but as a method whereby superficial agreement is avoided and somewhat naïve attempts to water down our differences are corrected, the dialectical method is valuable and courageous at this juncture. The application of this method is especially germane and favourable to our Anglican and Eastern problems. Yet we must not suppose too easily that anything so simple as a dialogue between Anglican and Orthodox can correspond with reality; it must at times involve three persons or even four to represent the fullness of the problem both from the Anglican and the Orthodox side. We Anglicans have more than one strand of tradition, and there are recognizable differences of approach (albeit with a truly common tradition) among our Orthodox brethren. It is the desire of *The Christian East* to be fair to this situation and to give it expression.

ON THE ECUMENICAL CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

by METROPOLITAN PANTELEIMON OF EDESSA AND PELLA

A. The Una Sancta

THE praiseworthy "Ecumenical Movement" which has been developed through the World Council of Churches has rekindled, as was natural, the right Christian hope for the union of the Churches. As a lively desire in many Christian hearts in all parts of the world this good idea for the union of the Churches is already seriously occupying churches and Christian organizations and individuals. Many ideas and opinions are expressed as to the fulfilment of this great Christian need and the realization of the prayer of all Christians "that all may be one" and that all the "Churches" really united in the unity of faith may give place to the *Una Sancta*, the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

For these manifestations and the efforts to which they give rise, the Orthodox observer can in principle rejoice. Because by these means the need for union is ever more vividly recognized and confessed, a need which to an ever increasing degree presses upon the ecclesiastically divided Christian world and especially upon Protestantism, which has good reason for anxiety inasmuch as by reason of its nature it finds itself in dogmatic chaos, which, in Protestant Confessions, can nowhere be restrained and is continually on the increase.

Certainly no one anywhere can doubt that a sincere confession of the need for union and a sincere desire for this union are the first steps towards union. But at the same time it is necessary that this great and solemn question of the union of the Churches should take the right direction and should be put in the right perspective. This is above all the first duty of the protagonists and fervent supporters of the Ecumenical Movement. If we desire union, if we are votaries of the *Una Sancta*, let us search for her and not labour vainly in our attempts to found her now. For the *Una Sancta* is a work neither of the present nor of the future. It is not something which either man or the Churches will construct. The *Una Sancta*, the work of God, is already an historical actuality and has its founder. It does not come about through simple attempts at union and mutual concessions and ordinations on the part of the Churches, but is sought for and discovered.

The assertion that no one of the Churches is to-day complete, that the *Una Sancta* is not—and in consequence never was—an actuality is not simply fearful presumption but something much worse than that. The Lord said "I will build my Church." Therefore the Church is One and is the Lord's who founded it. Is it possible then for us to lay claim for ourselves to this divine authority and design, and for us to try through mutual agreements and understandings to build the Church? Is it possible for us to doubt or deny that the Lord really founded and built His Church? Should we perhaps censure our Lord because, granted that He did found the Church, He failed in the very foundation of it, or very soon after its foundation, since the Church is no longer whole and complete? When did it cease to be complete? When did it fail? When did the *Una Sancta*

disappear or die? Because the Lord has proclaimed that "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." He "nourisheth and cherisheth it." The Paraclete, that is God Himself, is in it and abides in it "for ever." The Church is "the body of the Lord," "one body," and the Lord is "the head of the Church." Who is able to dismember the Lord or rather to decapitate Him and to bring death into the body which has as its head Him that "liveth for evermore"? Who can take the Holy Spirit away from the Church which was sent to the Church that it might abide with it throughout all ages "a witness of the words of salvation"?

It would be very much to the discredit of the Lord and the most Holy Spirit if the *Una Sancta* had really ceased to exist a long time ago. As a second fearful consequence of this theory comes the immunity and protection for every heresy and every schism and every error in Christendom. If the *Una Sancta* no longer exists to-day, then no one possesses "the whole truth" and consequently no one can find or reprove heresy and error. Since no criterion exists, there exists no one able and competent to judge, everything is "orthodox" and nothing is error. Here is the chaos of Protestantism.

Only the *Una Sancta* can face and meet error and heresy. Only it, since it is "subject to Christ" who is the truth, never errs from the truth, never goes against the Holy Spirit, and not only never does away with but always "establishes the law." Because the Father, in the name of the Lord Jesus, the Head of the Church, gave to the Church the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, to abide with it for ever. For the Paraclete teaches the Church all things, bringing all things to its remembrance, as the Lord said, takes from the Lord and proclaims to it and leads it into all truth. Prop and stay of the truth, the Church guards the truth and keeps safe the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and true religious teaching. It guards the Mystery of God, revealed in the Spirit to His holy Apostles and Prophets. It guards the traditions of the Apostles, handed down by word and through epistles, known to us or unknown. It guards the sound doctrine according to the Gospel of God, which Paul and the other Apostles of the Lord believed in.

Let no one say that these things refer to every "church" and every Christian, and not to the Church. They refer particularly and in minuteness to the Church. Because as we have seen the Church of Christ is One. They refer in consequence also to its members, as many as are attached to it as the members of a body are attached to the body. This *Una Sancta*, then, "as it has been taught" witnesses always to the truth and judges all who fail to achieve it; those who ignorantly and untenably distort the Scriptures and twist the Gospel of Christ; all those who by philosophy and vain deceit are tossed by every wind of doctrine and are cunningly led into delusion. At the same time, through the Church is made known the manifold wisdom of God (Ephes. iii. 10) and the fellowship of the mystery is brought to light which was hidden from the beginning of the world in God. And in the Church God is glorified by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end (Ephes. iii. 21). It is obvious that for such a mission the Church of the living God abides for ever and cannot stop its activity nor cease to live. The argument therefore that the *Una Sancta* does not

exist, that no Church to-day is whole and complete, does not hold good. Neither does the interpretation hold good according to which the Church is a wholly spiritual, mystical, invisible reality. This is the interpretation in which those who cannot exclude the existence of the *Una Sancta* but see that it is impossible to prove that it is the Church to which they belong, have of necessity to take refuge. But the work of the Church, as it has been described above, cannot be the concern of a Church which is absolutely invisible and spiritual. Certainly the Church is invisible and spiritual since it has for its head the Lord and since it has the Holy Spirit at work within it. But it is not only this. It is at the same time visible as well. Because the members of it are visible. Because it is formed and fixed also by elements which are visible and concrete. Triumphant in heaven the Church is a heavenly body because in heaven the corruptible puts on incorruption and the mortal, immortality. But militant upon earth, here, it dispenses the Sacrament of salvation; it bears also the image of the earthly, of this world. Because of this for the building up of this visible body of Christ and for the perfecting of the saints, being yet earthly and tied to this world, the Lord gave to the Church, Apostles and Prophets and Evangelists and Pastors and Teachers, all of them visible, all ministering in time and space in the visible Church. All of these, and of them in a special degree the Bishops, Priests and Deacons, are servants of the Church, stewards of the Mysteries of God and ministers of the Gospel, having from God their position in the Church, according to the dispensation of God given to them. On the point in question there is no room for doubt that to such men by the laying on of hands is given a special " charisma " and a peculiar ministry in the Church for which especially special persons are entrusted by ordination through the divine grace and the hands of the Apostles and the so-called Apostolic Succession. It is on this point encouraging that not a few Protestants have by now already been persuaded that priesthood in the Church and, in particular, the centre and source of it, episcopacy and the bishops, is an indispenable institution witnessed to by Holy Scripture and that, as St. Ignatius put it, " without a bishop it cannot be called a Church."

It is self-evident and based also on Holy Scripture that the priestly authority and grace of the bishop constitute him as the source and centre of the whole administration of the Church, exercising rights in regard to the obedience which is due and in general taking care of the Church of God. The well-known objection according to which the above could not have validity because the authority was given to the Apostles personally and that after them, or while they were still alive, the members of the Church were essentially equal to one another in it from the point of view of special authority given from above, denudes the Church of its above-mentioned spiritual and divine elements, to a large extent limits its work and mission, and presents it as a simple and ordinary human institution fatally falling into the chaos of human weaknesses and the " other gospels." The Apostles would hardly otherwise have proceeded to the ordination of bishops and priests, as it is already known that they did, with fasting and prayer, nor would Paul have written what he wrote so categorically on the

question to Timothy if matters had stood on this point as those believe who discard the special sacramental ministry in the Church and the necessity for it of the apostolic succession. Apart from this, such a radical change in the life of the Church ought not to be ignored by Holy Scripture and the Sacred Tradition. But we have no hint of it in either. The Apostles who, as we see in Holy Scripture, interested themselves even with questions which were not fundamental dealing with details about the conduct of divine worship, the comportment of Christians and their social relationships, would, without doubt, have given in detail both in writing and verbally, information and instruction on so serious a matter. What therefore is practised by the primitive Church on this point is the teaching and apostolic tradition, and is the apostolic Church. Because, for reasons set out elsewhere in this study, no setting aside of the Apostolic Tradition can be accepted on the part of the post-apostolic Church which, as is well known, is distinguished by its faithfulness and complete loyalty to the Gospel of Christ and the Tradition of the Apostles. Of course, properly speaking, the Bishop is not equal to the Apostles, because only the Church has the power to be that. But he is the substitute of the Apostles, their proxy, and Bishop of the Church. Both these furnish apostolic grace and the authority of the Church to the Bishop who is united both through the laying on of hands and in faith and submission to the Apostles and to the Church.

B. The Una Sancta is an Established Fact

The eternity of the Church which, as we have seen, is beyond possibility of doubt, not only justifies the ministry in the Church given by our Lord and transmitted by the Apostles but also explains the special powers and injunctions given by our Lord to the Apostles: "He who hears you, hears me—I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven—Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven—As my father sent me even so send I you—He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained—Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." The argument of certain non-Orthodox that the reference here is not to a special authority given to the Apostles and passed through them to certain limited persons, because the verses are directed at every Christian and to all the members of the Church, is a very weak one. Whatever concerns every Christian was early defined by the Apostles. An example is the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord which was first given to the Apostles alone. All Christians, to come to a second example, have the Lord's command that they should forgive the trespasses which their brethren commit against them, but only on their own part and not in the name of God. But the special gift, breathed on the Apostles, of the Holy Spirit, with a special authority to forgive or not the sins of men, generally, and thus to create a condition which would have validity even in heaven, is something very different. It refers exclusively to the Apostles

and those given authority by them in the Holy Spirit for the continuance of the "ministry" in the Church. Because otherwise the chaos on earth and in heaven would be terrific. It is strange how some who refuse to accept that this was a special gift and grace to the Holy Apostles summon to their aid the absence of the Apostle Thomas when the Lord appeared to the Holy Apostles for the first time after His Resurrection. Are they, however, certain that something of the sort did not happen more briefly at another appearance and during another conversation? Does it not seem that the ceremonial appearance of the Saviour after eight days to the disciples and Thomas took place chiefly for the sake of Thomas himself? How then dare we exclude the Apostle of the Lord from this gift which we know was given? Let us assume, however, that the gift has the meaning and significance given by them according to which the sinner is received as a member of the Church or, on the contrary, is rejected. Is not St. Thomas even then in an inferior position as an Apostle and "defective"? For, before the Lord said, "Whosesoever sins ye forgive," etc. He had breathed on the Apostles and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Or shall we be forced to say that our Lord breathed on the Apostles, gave to them the Holy Ghost and said what He said, but that these things are without any significance? More curious is the interpretation of some according to which "shall be bound in heaven" means that the binding has simply divine authority, while great knowledge of the Greek language is not needed for it to be understood that what is loosed or bound on earth in the Holy Spirit will be so also in heaven.

So that we may not seem to be leaving certain comments on one side, we add them here. It is not denied that there are certain points in the life and teaching of the Church not in any way opposed to Holy Scripture which are not explicitly referred to in it. Is this however sufficient reason for their rejection? And can the Church be censured for them, the ancient Church, the senior Church, the Church of the apostolic times and the apostolic Fathers, and of the first, the golden, Christian centuries? Always the exhortations and appeals of our Lord and the Apostles about the accurate compliance of the faithful with the commands and traditions and teaching resound in our ears, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you—We have no such custom nor any of the Churches of God—I praise you that ye remember me in all things and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you—As ye have therefore received Christ, so walk ye in Him . . . as ye have been taught—Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ—If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed—Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle—But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of." From these passages and the whole history of the primitive Church we can judge with certainty how strong and living was always in the life of the Church the written and spoken teaching of our Lord and the Apostles. St. Basil the Great in the middle of the fourth century wrote, "I think it

apostolic to abide by the unwritten traditions." What reason therefore would there be for the ancient Church, the Church of the apostolic times and of the apostolic Fathers, the Church of Clement and Ignatius, of Polycarp and Eirenæus, the Church of the Martyrs and Confessors of the Faith, the Church of the great Doctors and glorious Hierarchs, to err in its teaching or go astray from the truth? The Church itself, having passed through many dangers and tribulations, watchfully guarded and preserved in security the Gospel and all the sound doctrine. Heroically and victoriously it withstood every error. It triumphed in bitter struggles against heresies. There was no onslaught it was afraid of, no clash which it tried to avoid, and every time it came well out of the struggle. It proscribed unhesitatingly many of its most famous and powerful children because they had erred from the truth. It fearlessly cut away huge branches from its trunk because they had innovated against tradition and perverted the sound doctrine. Finally, through the Holy Bible, it furnished the Christian world with the sacred Scriptures. How then shall we accuse it of having erred from the truth and of having made innovations upon the apostolic traditions? How can we deny to it that it is the *Una Sancta?* How shall we be able under the light of history to lose the traces of the *Una Sancta* and to accept the assertion that the *Una Sancta* is not to be found anywhere to-day? How shall we be able, many centuries after it, to construct the *Una Sancta?* Will it be constructed on the basis of certain elements? Of the Bible only? But the Bible itself, the existence that is to say of the Bible, the preservation until our time of the Holy Scriptures, is a witness proving the existence of the *Una Sancta.* For it is well known whence Christianity received its Bible. How then at the same time that we accept the Bible with confidence from the ancient Church, can we refuse confidence in it as regards its faith and doctrine? If we should deny, if we should doubt or limit its authority, then the genuineness of the Bible is shaken as well. Certainly the Bible has authority in itself, but only the witness of God the Holy Spirit, which acts and speaks in the Church and through the Church, can witness to its genuineness. Consequently, the Church as led by the Holy Spirit, which abides with it for ever exactly in order that it may teach and proclaim and bring all things to remembrance, and that it may guide into all truth, does nothing in the absence of the Holy Spirit or in contradiction to it. As then the Church is authoritative and trustworthy in its decision as to the genuineness of Holy Scripture, so it is in all its life and activity. It has in everything its absolute authority. It is worthy of all confidence and it has not tradition which is contrary to the teaching of our Lord and to Holy Scripture.

Many people who have misunderstood certain errors and abuses in the Christian world, for which not the Church but its errant members are responsible, have denied the authority of the Church and have represented themselves and the members of the Church individually as being equal and equivalent to the Church, as Church. Consequence of this is a facile condemnation, very damaging to the Church, the accusation that the Church is erring on this or that point, that the Church, the holy and blameless Church, which is without spot or blemish or any such thing, has stains, has

vulnerable spots, has, as they say "shame." In consequence of this, denying the special and unique authority in the Holy Spirit of the Church, they maintain that they too are authoritative because they too, as individuals, or groups, have the Holy Spirit. But the appropriation of the Holy Spirit according to the advantage of each and the determination of the relation to him of the Holy Spirit according to the advantage of each, in ignorance and absence of the Church, is, on the basis of Holy Scripture, inadmissible; it is a Christianity new and strange to the Christianity of Holy Scripture and the primitive Church. It is in effect the beginning and first signs of Protestant chaos.

For the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit in what concerns the Gospel, the sacrament of salvation, the Church, has special distinctive marks and definite witnesses. The personal assertion of the person concerned and those who think like him is not sufficient. The special and immediate distinctive marks are powers and signs and wonders, are miraculous and supernatural events, such as those which Holy Scripture and the Sacred Tradition describe. In such circumstances the immediate intervention and witness of God is proved and the activity of the Holy Spirit is revealed without any doubt. Because "who is able to withstand God?" But the witnesses are the Apostles and the Church. That the Holy Spirit, for example, fell on Cornelius and those with him, that God had given them the same gift, is not inferred from the assertion of Cornelius and those with him but is the assurance of Peter which the Church accepts glorifying God. And for later generations the fact is recorded by the divinely-inspired author of the Book of Acts.

The Church therefore and it alone after the Apostles is never in error. But the individuals who are members of it are protected from error and kept in the truth only insofar as they are united in Christ with it and are subject to it, as the Church is subject to Christ. Since this is so, the individual members hold and preach in the Holy Spirit sound doctrine in the Church. Its members do not speak of themselves but simply proclaim what they receive from the Church.

C. The Sacred Tradition of the Una Sancta

It is self-evident that for the foundation of the *Una Sancta*, apart from the Bible, some written agreement also will be needed about the value of the Bible generally and the importance of the teaching in it and particularly about certain things which are fundamental to it, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, Christology, soteriology, ecclesiology and so on. But it is easily seen from what has preceded that those questions on which a real agreement will be achieved, that is to say the Holy Trinity, the incarnate dispensation and Christology have already been settled by the primitive Church. But in that case, the Scripture could say on behalf of the primitive Church to the new *Una Sancta*, "thou bearest not the root but the root thee."

The difficulty here of the defence by the second *Una Sancta* of its "orthodoxy" will be insurmountable. Since no Church can to-day be recognized as The Church, it follows that the *Una Sancta* itself, as the

creation of imperfect branches, will lack in essence trunk and root, and will be unable to have the authority and authenticity of the complete and perfect Church as the Christian conscience understands it. This very history of the foundation of this new Church will keep it always exposed to the criticism of its members and it will leave the door continually open to new protests and divisions and discords in the future. The fact that from such a foundation of a new *Una Sancta* it is impossible to secure its authority in the Holy Spirit is clear also from the hesitations of the Confessions concerned about the concessions which have been indicated, from the attempts of each Confession to impose its own tradition on the new *Una Sancta*, from their attitudes about not having laying on of hands or reordination and from the suggestions put about for reciprocal ordinations, according to which A will ordain B and B will ordain A. All these things are the natural fruit of the denial, necessary to Protestantism, to the real *Una Sancta* of its fundamental and divine elements and distinctive marks in which the doctrine of the so-called apostolic succession holds first place. At first sight perhaps it looks as though these things are evidence of a good disposition and Christian compliance for the sake of union, but an impartial enquiry reveals that at bottom there are hidden, sheer, human egoisms, with which it is impossible for the Spirit to have relations. Because the Holy Spirit is the truth, it is the Spirit of truth, and the truth is simple. The friend of the truth, he who is of the truth, recognizes and confesses the truth wherever he may find it. If then the laying on of hands means anything, what is the reason for there not being a straight and sincere and, let me say, Christian recognition of it? What is the reason that the Spirit should be ridiculed and should be manifested through acts which can hardly be taken seriously in these first steps towards union, if not the lack of unity of the Spirit? The Holy Scripture cries "One Spirit, the same Spirit." I am afraid therefore that it will grieve the Spirit if A ordains B and subsequently B ordains A.

The command of the Apostles is given in Holy Scripture about reverence for Tradition, which the *Una Sancta* kept and keeps. None the less, the aversion and impatience of some Confessions for the validity of this principle of Tradition in the life of the Church is very clearly shown. Yet such an impatience and aversion is unjust. Because without Tradition, as Holy Scripture and the primitive Church understand it, the magnificent construction which is called the perfecting of the saints and building up of the body of Christ has many omissions which hinder the cultivation and development of the Christian ideal. The casting aside of sound Tradition deprives the Church of a lot of sources which would be very useful and beneficial towards its own development according to Christ and the increase of its members. Indirectly, besides, even those who for known reasons deny the Tradition, recognize the authority of tradition in the Church and the right of the Church to keep the traditions inasmuch as the Church is the safe treasury whence the Bible was preserved, and from which the Christian world "received" it. There should be added to this also the bulk of Protestant tradition from the Reformation and since, both written and spoken, which many, if not all, of those who deny the Sacred Tradition

of the Church esteem very highly. It is true that the Protestant world, being near to the Roman Catholic Church, and having come under the influence of that "Tradition," cannot distinguish from it the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church as it is in the East. Being largely ignorant of the second they confuse it with the first, and consider that it too is responsible for the errors of the Roman Catholics, against which the Orthodox Church was the first to protest. The primacy of the Bishop of Rome, the doctrine of his infallibility, the addition of the "filioque" clause to the Creed, the special manner of granting remission of sins, the use of the term transubstantiation taken in a special sense, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God, the general celibacy of all the clergy, serious innovations in divine worship, the use of unleavened bread in the Holy Eucharist, and the reception of the Body of the Lord only by the laity and not of the Blood, etc. are inadmissible innovations, alien to Holy Scripture and the Sacred Tradition of the Church, which the Orthodox Church has opposed. I always remember what a Protestant Lutheran theological professor abroad once said to me in all sincerity at the end of the Orthodox Liturgy at which I had celebrated and the sermon which I had preached during it, "It is a great pity that Luther did not turn to the East instead of throwing us into the chaos in which we are." It is my humble opinion therefore that a more careful and dispassionate study of and research into Church affairs in the East can do nothing to harm the praiseworthy efforts which are being made towards union. In a speech I made at the Assembly of Amsterdam I said to those of my audience who were not Orthodox, "Don't be afraid of us as we are not afraid of you. What we are afraid of and cannot forgive and against which we are firmly opposed are propaganda and proselytism especially when they are carried on by antichristian and immoral means." We have of course differences, great differences, but the study and understanding of these differences made in good faith and with Christian dispositions will without doubt very much help, even if only after many years, the Lord working with us, for the truth to be known. Where the truth is recognized, the yoke of error is lifted, "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Here let this be noted too: Whatever things in the Orthodox Church are, in the Holy Spirit, regularly and with reason determined, have the truth conspicuous and evident in themselves, so that it is therefore easily discovered. But again whatever things are still officially left undetermined and subject to theological discussion give the right to the Orthodox Church to demand that it should not be judged or criticized on these points, on the basis of this or that isolated view or interpretation or judgment.

I think it necessary to avoid misunderstandings and exploitation on the part of prejudiced persons, to elucidate one delicate and inflammable point, referring to the differences between the Eastern and Western Churches. We are not "Mariolators" and the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God is not a doctrine of our Church. We confer however in deep piety fitting reverence and due honour to the Mother of the Saviour. And we are shocked at the animosity with which many non-Orthodox speak of her. These Christians who are so polite to the women of to-day and so prompt

in all chivalrous behaviour find no word of piety or reverence or honour for her who was blessed among women. Their tone of voice is full of dislike and aversion when they simply say "Mary" in speaking of her. And they nearly consider that those who honour the Mother of God are not Christians at all.

But "Mary" gave birth to the Son of God, the true God who was begotten of the Father before all worlds. She gave flesh and blood to the incarnate Lord. She ministered so devotedly to the work of the salvation of the world. Those who purposely belittle the "Mother of the Lord" but boast at the same time that they are people of the Book, are doubly exposed: against the Son of God and the Son of the Virgin, and against the divinely-inspired Scriptures. They have in this "That which judges them," the divine word itself in the Holy Scripture. For on the basis of the heavenly greeting to the Mother of God of the angel sent by God to her and of the other outstanding relevant passages in the Holy Scriptures, the Orthodox Church blesses and honours her who found favour with God, who was "full of grace," upon whom the Holy Spirit came, and whom the power of the Highest overshadowed and to whom He that is mighty has done great things. Since, according to the Holy Scriptures, "all generations"—of Christians, naturally—"shall call her blessed," it is good that those extremists who call Christians who honour the Virgin apostates from Christianity because of it, should examine on the basis of the "all generations" where they themselves stand in Christianity and whether they are included in these generations or not.

D. Love as the Basis of Union

The ideas formulated in the three preceding articles were set out for a poor support of the serious and soberminded efforts in the Ecumenical Movement and for a suspension of the steam-rollers which may perhaps have been set in motion on the road of union. Because the hurried and even polemical declarations of impetuous circles, happily few, of sons of thunder, but not disciples of love, cannot serve the cause of union, and probably will make difficult the future participation of the Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Movement. The real friend of the unity of faith and the union of all, has, before everything else, charity. Without charity, all faith and all knowledge is nothing and benefits nothing. Without charity, knowledge is the cause that the weak brethren perish for whom Christ died, and becomes a sin to the brethren and to Christ. Because knowledge alone puffs up: charity builds. But unity is primarily a building and not demolition or division. Charity is not easily provoked. It bears all things, hopes all things and endures all things. Only charity and patience therefore can bear good and lasting fruit. "With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." In this solemn and sacred question of unity, egoism and hastiness and asperity have no place, but everything must be done with patience and charity.

There is no doubt that in the efforts of the Ecumenical Movement the counsel of the wise will always be invaluable. The counsel, that is, of wise Christians, of course. But the wise and learned Christian as servant and

initiate of the wisdom from above is, above all things, humble. He is not boastful or contentious to a degree that gives offence to other Christians and other Churches. He is not characterized by zealotry or quarrelsomeness. Because "the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be intreated, full of mercy." It should be added here that the words of Holy Scripture about the purity of the wisdom which is from above, do not refer only to the purity of life and conscience of the wise Christian but include also the purity, the lack of adulteration, of his Christian knowledge. This chiefly is the wisdom from above, the wisdom of God in antithesis to the earthly wisdom, the wisdom of the world and of men. Long and bitter experience on this point, supported by history, teaches us that the fruits of earthly wisdom alone are "foolishness" and madness. Not only small and immaterial things in our holy faith but the very Gospel of Christ itself is often so misinterpreted and distorted that there is created out of such an "interpretation" and "arrangement" a "Christianity" unrecognizable and unknown to Holy Scripture and the primitive Church.

The Ecumenical Movement then, in addition to the above, has need of learning and spiritual wisdom. And not of things "which have indeed a show of wisdom." Because "Our Faith is not in the wisdom of men but in the power of God. Not in enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." This being granted, those Churches which have remained united with the primitive Church, and those which have not been completely cut away from it, ought to agree without hesitation that the new versions of "Christianity" cannot, as they are to-day, contribute positively to the work of the Ecumenical Movement. It is indicated likewise that the Churches should accept the proposal made by ourselves and other non-Orthodox, according to which the accepted basis of the Ecumenical Movement would be the Nicene Creed. Because this Creed witnesses classically to the Christian faith, the whole faith of the Apostles, and excludes new forms of Christianity. The Churches would easily then draw together in Christ on a united front against Antichrist, in good co-operation on the so-called practical level of Christianity, and without haste but also without interruption, towards mutual study and knowledge of one another. In the short so-called parable of the Sower, our Lord, giving a picture of the kingdom of God, said that man casts seed into the ground and labours in every way to cultivate it, but the seed springs and grows up "he knoweth not how" according to the all-wise and all-powerful plan of the Creator. Inasmuch as the whole work of the Ecumenical Movement is not a mission of those working in it through their participation—Because "it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy"—let us leave most of it to the Lord of the work and let us hasten slowly "in all wisdom and prudence and spiritual understanding" in order that we may not through excessive zeal persecute the Church (Phil. iii. 6) "lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed" (Heb. xii. 13).

[Translation by Miss J. B. Gaselee from *Ekklesia*, No. 6, 15-3-50; No. 7, 1-4-50; No. 8, 15-4-50; No. 9, 1-5-50.]

Athens, May 16th, 1950.

THE DIVINE LITURGY OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

RECEIVING substantially its present form at the end of the Justinian age (sixth to seventh century A.D.) this imperial rite of Constantinople, along with its sister rite of St. Basil, has superseded other Eastern Church liturgies, and since the main results of the triumph of the Ikonodules gave it its last enrichments, has become typical of Orthodox eucharistic worship. Keeping faithfully to the main outlines of the worship of antiquity, it presents to-day, with minor omissions and adjustments, the features common to the worship of the undivided Church.

For the non-Orthodox worshipper at the Divine Liturgy it is necessary to explain briefly its outward setting. The congregation is in the nave of the church, the bishop, if present but not actually celebrating, on his throne on the south side of the choir, the great ikon-screen divides the nave from the sanctuary. The clergy are in the sanctuary itself, in which is placed the Holy Table, and on its north side, the Table of Preparation of the Gifts of Bread and Wine. The deacon, who plays so important a part in Orthodox worship, acting as the connecting-link between the people and the celebrant of the Liturgy and directing its successive steps, will be seen from time to time standing outside the central gates of the sanctuary in the ancient place of the ambon intoning the litanies of supplication which are a marked feature of the Eastern rites, and directing the worship of the congregation. These litanies of supplication, with their choral responses, lead up to and synchronize with the Prayers of Supplication being said within the sanctuary by the celebrant at the Holy Table, and are completed by a loud ascription of praise to the Divine Trinity. At the Holy Table itself there will be more often than not in a church of any size and dignity the celebrant of the Mysteries who faces east, and other celebrants with him at the sides and even opposite him. Such co-celebrants join in heart and mind with the offering of the Divine Sacrifice, performing certain acts and prayers in its course, but leaving the central acts to the celebrant himself, whether he be the bishop or his canonical substitute.

The Divine Liturgy lends itself readily to division into stages, although its most striking characteristic is its living unity of form from beginning to end, avoiding the punctuations and climax of its modern Western equivalents. Faithful to a more ancient temper of liturgical worship the devout worshipper finds himself again and again imperceptibly at a new level of participation in the divine mystery, in the presence of a new irruption of the heavenly into time and space, a new lifting up of the earthly to the region of the heavenly super-substantial altar in the presence of the divine and blessed Trinity, to whom this, the supreme act of the Church's worship, is addressed.

Although this is so, the Liturgy lends itself readily to articulation into stages and component parts. Without going into the vexed and complicated problems of provenance and evolution these stages may be outlined as follows:

1. While the choir-office is being said, the Gifts of Bread (leavened) and Wine are being prepared by the priest (with the aid of a deacon) within the

ikon-screen at the Table of Prothesis or Preparation. This has become in its elaboration a service in itself. Its purpose is by symbolic immolation to prepare the oblations of bread and wine on the paten and in the cup, for the solemn entrance of the Gifts in the Liturgy itself, and their disposition for consecration and communion. What bread is left over from this preparation, along with the gifts of the Faithful, becomes the Antidoron, distributed immediately after the conclusion of the service.

2. The Liturgy itself may be divided into two discernible parts: the Synaxis or Liturgy of the Catechumens, and the Anaphora and Liturgy of the Faithful. In the Synaxis, which is derived ultimately from Jewish non-sacrificial worship, stand out the Little Entrance (or corresponding Western Introit), the reading of the Apostolic Epistle and the solemn singing of the Holy Gospel by the deacon from the ambon or from a pulpit. All these are introduced by litanies of supplication in the form described above, and the singing by the choir of the appropriate portions for the Sunday or Feast Day. The Great Entrance of the prepared gifts is a liturgical act of great magnificence and solemnity, in which all the clergy and attendants join. It is an engrossing study, outside this very elementary exposition, to try to trace the growth of the splendour in liturgical expression as well as in ceremonial acts of the Great Entrance. It is perhaps enough to suggest that the vast scale of the Church of the Holy Wisdom at Constantinople, the length and splendour of the procession there from the Table of Prothesis to the Holy Doors of the Sanctuary, has left its indelible mark on even the humblest Great Entrance to this day. Added to this, the character of the reverence paid to the prepared gifts and its close association by St. John of Damascus with the reverence paid to the holy ikons of the Church, would be greatly strengthened and emphasized by the restoration of the ikons in the ninth century.

The gifts are delivered to the celebrant who receives them with intercessory prayer and places them on the Holy Table. The doors of the church are closed liturgically. After the Creed has been said by the person of highest rank present outside the sanctuary, the Anaphora begins, the command to the Faithful to lift up their hearts and to give thanks to the Lord, leading to the triumphantly sung Trisagion. The calling to mind of the divine Acts culminates in the narration of the institution of the Last Supper, the recitation (in a loud voice) of the words of Institution, and the calling down of the Holy Spirit to bless the Gifts and change them by His power into the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. After commemoration of the Holy Mother of God and All Saints, and prayer for the living and departed, the Our Father is recited by a person of standing and dignity, the celebrant and clergy make their communions, and communion is given in both kinds by a spoon from the holy Cup to those who present themselves at the Holy Gate. The congregation is blessed, the dismissal hymn is sung, and the Liturgy is completed. The giving of blessed bread in the Antidoron is the last act before the congregation disperses.

Such is the form of this august rite. To the student of Eastern liturgies the above account must be jejune and inadequate, but it is for the worshipper that this simplified schema is intended. It is not easy for a non-

An owl outside is mourning for the dead.
O night of torture, dark and long and deep!
Said I, The light is gone for ever, the dawn will come no more!
And when I saw its first faint glimmering through a crack,
A light come from another world, it seemed to me,
And for another life the hope.
I lift the soulless body's load, I bind it to the mule,
And starting with the dawn arrive before the night,
Dragging that silent horseman,
I gave him back to her who bore him and had lost him.
He sleeps now by her side, while on the further hand,
She keeps an empty place for me.

My Father, you have heard the sin. Is it possible
That any greater, heavier, darker sin should hap in all the world?
That He who made us should be made by these my hands,
His Body and His Blood be touched and handled
By these my very fingers? . . . My Father, O my Father,
Say not that it remained what it had been before,
Just Bread and Wine!
By the deep longing that I felt in that dark hour
By the undying fire that burns still in these hands,
By the o'er-spreading light on that quenched face,
Within myself I feel the Awful Mystery took place!
My Father, you have heard my sin. . . . But if I did it,
For sake of him who died untended in that lonely Inn,
It is no crime of his: he sleeps a Christian's sleep now in his tomb.
To me alone hell's punishment. The sin is mine.

Your eyes that look at me, my Father, why are they full of tears?
Your lips that gently move, my Father, what do they say for me?
Why do you leave your hand upon my head, my Father?
Is this a curse for me, or do you bless me, Father?

A.O.

A SEMINARY FOR PARISH CLERGY IN NORTHERN GREECE

by PETER HAMMOND

"OF Pastors," says George Herbert, "some live in the universities, some in noble houses, some in parishes residing on their cures." It is with these last that the following notes are concerned and, to particularize, with the country parsons of Western Macedonia. The Church of Greece has within the last few years made great efforts to provide a sound training for her parish clergy. Despite very great material difficulties several new seminaries (*φροντιστήρια*) have been founded within the last five years, and there are, in all, some fourteen of these institutions now flourishing. The famous Rizarcion ecclesiastical school in Athens celebrated its centenary during the German occupation; the dioceses of old Greece are also served by seminaries at Corinth, Patras and Pyrgos, in the Peloponnese, and at Lamia, Larissa and Volos, in Thessaly. Crete has its own seminary, and that in Patmos has lately been reopened. There is another old foundation

at Isannina, the Ιεροδιδασναλείον βελλᾶς, of which the present Archbishop of Athens was once director, and which serves the whole of Epirus. The clergy of Thrace and of Eastern Macedonia can now attend courses at Xanthi (founded in 1945), at the monastery of Aghia Anastasis near Galatista in the Halkidiki peninsula—to which the students have recently returned after a long period of exile in a nearby village—or at Thessaloniki where there is a "higher seminary." Another institution for the training of parish clergy has recently been opened at Kozani, in Western Macedonia, and it is this which forms the subject of the notes which follow.

The "Lower Ecclesiastical Seminary of the Metropolis of Kozani," as it is locally known, was founded in 1946 during the lull which followed the Varhiza agreement. During the first few months of its existence there were nearly 90 students in residence. Many dropped away, however, as fighting became general early in the following year, and by the winter of 1948–49 when the situation in the country dioceses was at its worst and the whole parochial organization had disintegrated, only 25 students remained. Matters have improved of late, the refugees are trickling back to their villages, and the number in residence at the end of February had risen to 35. The seminary is under the supervision of the Metropolitan of Servia and Kozani, Mgr. Konstantinos. The Director, Mr. Alexandros Gainiatsos, is a lay theologian, a member of the Zoe Confraternity. He has been in charge of the seminary since its foundation.

It offers a course lasting two years to parish priests, and to candidates for ordination, drawn not only from the diocese of Kozani but from the whole of Macedonia. Of the 35 students at present at the seminary the great majority come from the villages of Western Macedonia; from the dioceses of Kozani, Grevena, Kastoria, Florina, etc., but there are others from places as far distant as Drama and Katerini. Only three of the students are laymen, and some have been in orders for many years.

The seminary is accommodated in a building attached to the church of S.S. Cosmas and Damian, which serves as its chapel. Here Mattins and Evensong are sung daily, and the Holy Liturgy is celebrated on Sundays and Holy Days. The church contains a wonder-working ikon and has long been a celebrated resort for the sick from the whole region round about Kozani. It serves also as a chapel for the "Christian Unions" of the town. It is slowly being restored and refurnished as the means become available. It is planned to throw down the γυναικωνίτις, which is now unsafe, and to extend the church northwards. A small παρεκκλήσιον serves as a convenient place where confessions can be made. Those among the students who live within easy distance of Kozani are accustomed to go home on Saturday and to return on Monday morning. They also go to their parishes for the great festivals. In other cases some provision is made for the parishes concerned. The Metropolitan of Grevena, for example, allows only one parish priest from each group of three villages to be away at any particular time.

The programme of studies is eminently practical. It is grounded, as is fitting, "in the Book of books, the storehouse, and magazine of life and comfort, the Holy Scriptures," and is designed to equip the village *pappas*

for the better fulfilment of his varied ministry. The director is assisted by the ἱεροκήρυξ, or preacher, of the diocese; a lay theologian of the Apostoliki Diakonia. The choirmaster from the metropolis gives lectures on the Byzantine chant, and a local doctor on the rudiments of first aid (for does not the country parson desire to be all to his parish, and not only a pastor but also a physician); a little medical knowledge does, indeed, constitute a very valuable addition to the skill of a country priest in a region where a visit to a doctor can be a formidable undertaking involving a journey of eight or nine hours across appallingly difficult terrain. Special attention is also paid to the organization of "catechetical schools" in the villages. It must be remembered when considering the range of studies that the level of general education among the parish clergy is not high. The Greek country parson not only "condescends to the knowledge of tillage and pasturage," but commonly devotes many hours a day to hard manual toil, in the fields or at some craft, as well after his ordination as before. Candidates for the course at Kozani are required to have reached the third class of the secondary school, and this is a normal rule for the "lower" seminaries.

The furnishing and equipment of the building is simple in the extreme. The lecture room is twice a day transformed into a refectory. The students sleep seven or eight to a room on the bare boards, and St. Benedict's maxim "*stramenta . . . sufficiant matta, sagum et lena et capitale,*" is observed by all alike. The bishop's desire to create a small library for the seminary has not yet been realized owing to lack of means, and the support of a large family does not leave the average student any money with which to buy himself books. Nevertheless, the seminary has already established itself as a real centre of pastoral and liturgical teaching in the mountain dioceses of Western Macedonia, and its influence can be seen to-day in several score of parishes dispersed throughout this barren region. Catechetical schools are flourishing for the first time in remote hamlets under the guidance of a parish priest who was trained at this seminary. The Holy Sacrifice is offered week by week with renewed fervour in many a ruined church, and there are not a few country parsons—not all of them young men—who have gone back to their villages after spending two years at Kozani with a quickened realization of the high dignity of their calling. Not all the clergy, it is hardly necessary to add, are fully convinced as yet of the utility of the new seminary. I recall one old gentleman who was highly indignant at his Metropolitan's suggestion that he might profitably spend two years at the seminary, and who maintained that after 27 years in the sacred ministry he could learn only "from the Lord." There has, too, been much hilarity in many a rural tavern that some grave *pappas* should have been "sent back to school" for a couple of years. The institution is, after all, something of a novelty, and the Greeks are an intensely conservative race. We may hope, nevertheless, that with the return of a measure of security to this sorely-tried land the Kozani seminary, with the other institutions which serve the Church of Greece, may exert an ever-increasing influence upon the parish clergy, and that it may send forth into the villages a steady stream of true pastors—men who are "not witty, or learned, or eloquent, but *holy*"—for in Greece as elsewhere that is perhaps the greatest need of all.

THE RELATIONS OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH TO THE CHURCHES OF THE EAST

A Paper read before the S.P.G. by Bishop G. F. Popham Blyth, Bishop in Jerusalem 1887–1914, in June, 1897.

This statement was made to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel by Bishop Blyth, Anglican bishop in Jerusalem over fifty years ago. It is contributed from his papers to *The Christian East* by a member of his family, and is an important landmark in the history of our relations with the Eastern Churches and the expression of the mind of a bishop of the Anglican Church to whose zeal and good will the Orthodox owe much both in Palestine and farther afield. In reading it to-day we should bear in mind the great changes that have taken place since 1897 both in the life of the Orthodox Church and in our own relations with her.

IT is my privilege to represent our Communion at the Mother City of Christianity, where representatives of all other Churches have right of presence, without detriment to the episcopal jurisdiction of the Throne of St. James of Jerusalem; just as their apostolic founders had a common home at the Holy City. I represent there also the missionary character of our Communion, amongst those who certainly do feel that missionary spirit is the life of a Church, and whose own responsibility is primarily in the missionary enterprise of the Church of Christ in the East. . . . But whilst I am saying that we of the Anglican Communion share the common right of the branches of the Catholic Church to episcopal representation at the Mother City of Christianity, both as an independent Apostolic Church and as a Missionary Church, I do not forget that the Throne of St. James has been more prompt than most of ourselves to acknowledge this. It was with true brotherly sympathy that the Patriarch of Jerusalem desired the revival of the Anglican Bishopric (in which he had had the concurrence of the Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople), in order that our Communion might have representation at the Holy City. And the same prelate stated to me his appreciation and acceptance of the *missionary* character of our Church. I was speaking to him of what many Anglican Churchmen feel a tender ground—the missionary work of our Church in the three Patriarchates of the East within whose jurisdiction I represent you. He said: "The Missions of the Church of England, when not aggressive upon Christian Churches, have my sympathy and my blessing: we are not now able to undertake them ourselves." In these terms His Beatitude evidently reserved a missionary responsibility which the late Archbishop of Canterbury *(Archbishop Edward White Benson)* also acknowledged. And I think, too, he has (identically with the consequences of the Archbishop's words) forecast some future connection, which the Anglican Communion, in days of more intimate unity, may retain in Missions to the sons of Abraham, whether Jews or Arabs—a prospect of common responsibility and of brotherly association. The Archbishop's words are so true of the East, and so strongly to the point in considering the relations of the Anglican Church to the Churches of the East, that they cannot be too widely understood. He said (I have but time to quote the leading words of an address of very great value): "The Eastern mind must be approached by Oriental Missionaries. The Apostles were Oriental Missionaries. Our only hope of

influencing the world on that side is through the Oriental Churches. They are not a whit less clever than they were in the early ages of the Church. Every one is aware of their intellectual subtilty, acuteness, penetration; and their power of interpretation of Scripture is marvellous, and beyond our own. This is an underlying fact which must greatly influence the future. The Oriental Churches are the only Missioners who will produce an effect upon Mahommedans, and the problem is how to raise the Oriental Churches to the ambition of doing it. Let them rise to the cultivation and the knowledge of Scripture, which we seek, and to a certain extent obtain, and they will fall into their places directly. They are still, I am certain, Christ's great instrument for converting half the world." I would add to the Archbishop's words the thought that Oriental Missions of the future (including surely the revival of the Missionary Church first planted, the Church of the Hebrews) may be very materially influenced by Anglican Church sympathy, experience, and co-operation. It is an unhappy and culpable misconception which undervalues the position and prospects of Oriental Churches, or which aggresses on them. They not only share with ourselves the eclipse which the unscriptural and unhistorical shadow of the Patriarchate of the West has cast over the Christian world, but they have to witness for Christ under an oppression which we ought not to forget. It was hard enough upon the English Church to wait for a *pallium* from Rome, during certain centuries; but what would have been the condition of the English Church, in education, in knowledge of Scripture, in missionary activity, had the names of candidates for the Archbishopric of Canterbury, from the date of St. Augustine until now (for that about covers the duration of Church oppression in the Patriarchates at least of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria) to be referred to the Ruler of Islam, for the rejection of names favourable to the spiritual and educational growth of the Church, and had the Chair of Canterbury then been left too often to the ambition of the highest bidder? Those who remain what they are under existing circumstances, must have been preserved as by a miracle for some noble destiny presently to be revealed to them. It is due from us that we should be just to them; it is in our interest to desire their sisterly aid in advancing the cause of Christ. And over all is the constraining influence of His Will that there should be no severance, except by His excision, amongst the branches of the True Vine. The discords of Christianity are its chief hindrance in the East, but the Will of Christ is its unity. It is most touching to hear, as I commonly hear, prelates of the East speak of this Will of Christ, and say that with our back to our differences, and our face to the common Creed, we ought to pray for its fulfilment. Their expressions are not those of men who say sweet words which have no meaning. They are the grave plea of Prelates of the sister Churches which have been in bondage for thirteen centuries, and they are addressed to a Communion which is spiritually free, and is become powerful throughout their older world, and in those new colonies and Mission fields which have been opened to the world of to-day. They see *that* difference—and is it not for the free and the powerful to make the first move?

But if there are real difficulties of action on their part, there are restraints placed also upon ourselves. The first thing that seems to strike an English mind with regard to the subject of intercommunion between Churches (though the shock is less prominent to the conservative Oriental) is, "What a tremendous plunge it is!" Is it really so? Or is it that we want time and information for the entrance of a new and foreign idea? We cannot, of course, orientalize the West or occidentalize the East in ways of thought or liturgical habits. But our Lord did not found two Churches, but one Church. And the Church had one Creed. And let us ask ourselves what *formal* step was taken on either side, and when, to repudiate or excommunicate the other? We know communion is *suspended* between us; but does not suspension suppose a position which, having never been denied, requires only to be reaffirmed? I put that thought, only a few days since, to three prominent Bishops at Jerusalem, and they accepted it. There has been severance between the East and West, but that severance was the act of Rome. And we are not Rome. When did the Anglican Church take any formal action against the Oriental Churches? But there are other things to note also. A Patriarch of the Orthodox Church said to me (and we must remember that his *ecclesiastical* rank is equal to that of the Patriarch of Rome): "I acknowledge the apostolic descent of the Orders of the Anglican Church, but I am somewhat doubtful about some of your baptisms. We require total immersion." He admitted, however, that the validity of the Sacrament does not depend on quantity in the outward sign; and that there is not actual denial of the sufficiency of affusion, by the Orthodox Church. Upon this my Chaplain read to him the rubric of the Church of England, which prescribes total immersion, but accepts affusion, and does not recognize any other mode of administration. I told him that, of my own knowledge, total immersion was not infrequent, wherever asked for, in English Missions in the East; and that I had myself lately immersed infants. He replied, "Then such Baptism is also valid."

There is, I need not say, no political ambition whatever in any matter of friendly intercourse between ourselves and other Churches; but as politics are so commonly pressed in the Holy Land, it is difficult to persuade our neighbours that we are not mischievous, especially when we are so given to writing to the papers. But such difficulties do not exist in dealing with individual national Churches of the Greek Communion, or exist only in a limited degree. And we may expect, at any time, that the most important movements may be inaugurated through these national Churches, and notably through the good will and intelligence of the powerful Church of Russia. At the same time we must not forget, and she will not wish us to forget, that the four Thrones of the East are the four Patriarchates; and that these act in concert with each other in Church matters, and that *their* action is necessary.

A few words here on the subject of intercommunion are not foreign to the purpose of this paper. It has two aspects, one between ourselves and other Churches, and the other regarding intercommunion amongst Churches severed from each other. The act of intercommunion is, of course, a very serious question, which has to be carefully, theologically, and prayerfully

considered on both sides. But to many minds it is a sort of bugbear. Their thought of intercommunion is not associated with the sanctity of our Lord's Will, but with the horrors of sectarian prejudice. What is it, really, in its simplest form? Well, if you go and reside in some village, say of Armenia, Syria, Russia, where there is no service of your own Church, though there is between yourselves and the people the difference between Orientals and Europeans, you see that "God has made of *one blood* all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth"; and you sympathize with them; and they with you, in the ties of a common humanity. And so in their religious life, you see the parish priest instructing his people faithfully, and they worshipping according to their orders, with sincerity as real as your own. Christ has given to all Churches His *one Creed*, and you feel the tie of a common Christianity. At last, perhaps, on some great festival, you think, "This priest's apostolic descent is as valid as that of my own clergy, and his ministrations as duly authorized. Why should I be cut off from communicating with Christ's people because I do not endorse all the specialities of an Oriental Church?" You ask permission to communicate, say on Easter Day, and are permitted with readiness and sympathy. This was the line adopted by that great missionary, Bishop French, when studying Arabic in an obscure village in Syria. Now this would be an act of private and unauthorized intercommunion. But the case would be different were you able to say: "My Church and your Church acknowledge each other's Orders and administration of Christ's Sacraments, and are on terms of formal intercommunion; I claim, therefore, the right, as an English Churchman, of communicating at your altar, under the present circumstances." That act would be based on the rights of intercommunion between Churches, not on those of private Christian charity. Where is the terror of it? It will have to come, as inevitably as have international travelling and telegraphy. Time fails me to do more than glance at intercommunion between Eastern Churches. But it is a happy thought that if we *can* presently enter into formal and authorized intercommunion with one of these sisters of the Catholic Church, our Church may have grace, of our common sisterhood, to bring together those who are severed less by theological differences (which time has made mere films) than by political, natural or geographical rivalries.

I have said enough to convince you that there is a very fine and wide field open to us, under the commonest Christian charity, and within the present conditions of our intercourse with East and West. And the aim of promoting Christ's Will is worthier the ambition of a pure and Apostolic Church than is the Pharisaism which stands apart from sister Churches, or would Anglicize them, were that possible. It is English isolation which misrepresents to itself the case, and strikes against obedience to the charge of Christ. The Churches of the East *are Oriental*, which is not always intelligible; and they are under thraldom, which is not always remembered. But I would ask one of those who hurl vain prejudices against the Rock of Christ's Will to show me a more learned, more spiritual-minded, more charitable, more enlightened Catholic Churchman of their own party than was the late Patriarch Gerasimos of Jerusalem, on the side of inter-

communion. I should feel honoured to meet him. . . . I want scholars—Christian scholars and means, to enable me to meet the challenge of a late Patriarch: "We have done all that social kindliness can do; it is time to essay something further."

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

by Rev. George Florovsky, D.D., S.T.D.

(reprinted with the author's permission)

WHAT can the Eastern Church contribute to the Ecumenical Movement? Before we answer this question, and in order to answer it properly, we must first clarify our terms of reference. What is the Eastern Church, and what is the Ecumenical Movement? Let us begin with the latter question.

I

The Ecumenical Movement is an antinomical venture. It is an endeavour to overcome the existing disruption of Christendom, to heal the Christian schism. Its ultimate goal and aim is Christian unity. But its starting point is Christian disunity. There is an ecumenical problem simply because Christendom is divided. In the "ecumenical sphere," we have to begin precisely with "our unhappy divisions." The major tragedy of Christian history and existence is that unity did not last very long and has never been fully realized. Divisive and disrupting powers have been at work, as they should not have been. I am not speaking now of doctrinal aberrations or heresies. I am concerned at the moment with what I would describe as a crisis of Christian universalism. I mean that the true unity of the Christian mind has been lost. Christians retired into their separate cells. They lost the common Christian perspective. They forgot that they belonged together. It was, as it were, too much for a frail man to dwell in a truly ecumenic world, to be a citizen of the Church universal. He needed a local Church of his own, of his own city, or race, or persuasion, rather than the Church universal only "sojourning" in his city. Christianity was, so to speak, much too big for him, as it is indeed for most of us.

We dread a universal perspective even in the Church universal. We are preoccupied with our domestic traditions and moods of feeling and thinking. We are hopelessly provincial in our Christian convictions. Our Christian horizon is utterly narrow and limited. And usually we simply refuse to go beyond the boundaries of our local and inherited traditions and customs. The unity of the Christian mind was lost long before Communion was broken. The schism was first consummated in minds before it was enacted in practice in the realm of rule and administration. This was the basic misfortune of Christian history. Yet, even divided Christianity is still one Christianity, at least in aspiration. What is or would be suicidal is precisely to be satisfied with the schismatic state of affairs and to invent excuses for local or "provincial" preferences. It is here that the ecumenical problem arises and the ecumenical movement begins.

B E L G I U M S A F

We shall confine ourselves to one particular aspect of that vast problem. And first of all we have to face the split between the Greek and the Latin mind in the early ages of the Church. Of course, this split was never complete or absolute, yet its impact on the whole destiny of Christianity was enormous. Somebody has wittily remarked that language is given to man as a means of communication, but it is used rather as a means of isolation. There is dreadful truth in the story of the tower of Babel. Indeed, the common tongue has been lost, i.e., precisely the common mind, because language itself is a system of ideas. The problem of language was acute in the primitive Church. The evangelization of the world, the preaching of the Good News to all nations, or simply to the "nations," *gentes* or ἔθνη, i.e., to the heathen and non-Jewish world, required and implied a transcription of the original message into the terms and categories of other tongues. The problem was greatly simplified by the existence of a universal or common language at that time, common at least within the limits of the "universal" Empire.

In this historical context the prominence given to the Greek Bible was quite comprehensible. It provided a common ground for Christian preaching, nay, the common language, i.e., a set of categories and terms. It was just the transcription that was wanted for the missionary task and purpose. The need to check it by the "Hebrew truth," *veritas hebraica*, in the phrase of St. Jerome, was felt by scholars (like Origen or Jerome), but practically and pastorally this was irrelevant and even confusing. The New Testament, in any case, was composed in Greek, though by people for whom it was not their native tongue. In a sense, Greek is still the common language of the whole of Christendom, and indeed the *only* common language, and everybody is bound to refer to the Greek Testament as to the original, even when we detect a Jewish background and a Jewish mind behind the Greek idiom. Moreover, for centuries the undivided Church was thinking in Greek, even when she spoke various tongues. As a matter of fact, Greek was used in the West too, even at Rome, as the language of worship and preaching, possibly till the middle of the third century if not later. The Church of Rome was latinized only gradually, and only with St. Augustine and St. Jerome did Latin become really the language of great Christian literature and thought. Yet even Augustine and Jerome were hellenistic in mind, though Augustine's Greek was rather poor and deficient.

Let us keep in mind our true question: we are concerned now not with difference but with isolation. The tragedy comes when people forget that they "belong together" and lose the wider perspective. The East and the West were different from the outset. Yet the feeling of a universal fellowship was strong. Eastern Christians felt themselves quite at home in the West and Western in the East. The disruption comes later. Already in the time of Augustine Greek was not studied in the West, although his immediate predecessor at the See of Hippo, Valerius, was a Greek and did not know any Latin. The rise of Latin-thinking Christianity in the West has been overlooked, or perhaps contemptuously ignored, in the East. In the East they took little notice of the rising "Latin Christianity" and did

not care for translations. Very little of Augustine was ever translated into Greek. On the other hand, Latin translations of the Greek Fathers were never very numerous in the West and did not cover a large field, with few exceptions. Latin Christian civilization steadily decayed since Augustine, and fresh nations came on the historical scene, but when the recovery came very little of the Greek heritage was saved, and living continuity with the common past of the Church universal was broken, except what has been preserved in the treasury of worship.

While the West was lapsing into its dark ages, the East was still going on in spite of all external disasters and inner troubles. The final collapse of Byzantine Christianity came many centuries later, when the West had already recovered, or perhaps was already on the eve of its own autumn. This mental divorce of the East and the West was never complete. The common ground was never lost. What really happened was much worse. *It was forgotten that there was a common ground.* And very often what was in fact common was mistaken for something peculiar and distinctive. A custom was developed in the West to treat even the Greek Fathers as exotic Orientals. The Reformation did not change this attitude of suspicion and ignorance. The total outcome of this age-long estrangement was the inability, on both sides of the cultural schism, to ascertain even the existing agreements and the tendency to exaggerate all the distinctive marks. Of course there was another motive for this mutual misunderstanding which is still relevant in our day. Both sides were on the defensive: everything Greek smelt "schism" for the Roman taste, and everything Latin suggested "Popery" to the Eastern.

By no means am I going to suggest that there was no difference between the East and the West. But surely not every difference and not even every disagreement is, or should be, a lawful and sufficient reason for divorce. There is no reason to believe that these differences or varieties are ultimately irreconciliable and cannot or should not be integrated or rather reintegrated into the fullness of the Catholic mind. Possibly this reintegration has not yet been conscientiously attempted. I am pleading now that such a task should be urgently undertaken. We have to examine the existing tensions and divergences with a prospective synthesis in view. I mean exactly what I say: a synthesis and integration, and not just a toleration of the existing varieties or particular views. No ultimate synthesis is possible in history but still there is a measure of integration for every age. Our fault is precisely that we are behind the time, behind our own time. We have to recognize the common ground that existed a long time ago. This seems to be the most imposing ecumenical task.

II

We are now prepared to discuss the prospective contribution of the Eastern Church to the whole ecumenical endeavour. We have, however, to warn ourselves against the inherent inadequacy of a geographical language. The "East" and the "West" in Christian language are not simply topographical or ethnographical labels. These names stand for principles and attitudes, not merely for territories. All local Churches have indeed

their particular contributions. But the Eastern Church is in an unparalleled position to contribute something more and something different. The witness of the Eastern Church is precisely a witness to the common background of ecumenical Christianity because she stands not so much for a local tradition of her own but for the common heritage of the Church universal. Her voice is not merely a voice of the Christian East but a voice of Christian antiquity. The Eastern witness points not only to the East but to an *Oikoumene*, in which East and West belong together in the peace of God and in the fellowship of the primitive tradition.

By her witness the Eastern Church does not impose her own claims but rather reminds all Christians of their common heritage and of their common background. There is a sort of an ecumenical challenge implied in the witness of the Eastern Church. This is her most distinctive and peculiar contribution. We may differ widely in our attitude toward Christian antiquity, but we cannot easily deny that there is a problem and a challenge in the witness of the undivided Church of Christ. I do not mean uniformity, but rather a fellowship of convictions. And since the common ground and common mind have been lost and we have to regain or rediscover them in our concrete and existential situation, it is to be primarily a fellowship of search.

In one sense, the Eastern Church is a survival of ancient Christianity as it has been shaped in the age of the Ecumenical Councils and of the Holy Fathers. The Eastern Church stands exactly for the Patristic tradition. Surely it was, and must be, the common tradition both of the East and the West, and here resides its primary importance and its uniting power. But in the West, in the Middle Ages, this Patristic tradition was reduced or impoverished (for a considerable period of time "Patristic" meant in the West simply "Augustinian," and everything else was ignored or forgotten), and again it has been obscured and overburdened with a later scholastic superstructure. Thus in the West it became a sort of an historical reminiscence, just a piece of the past that had passed away and must be rediscovered by an effort of memory. Only in the East has it been kept alive for centuries up to the present time. By no means is it simply an archaic relic, a shadowy remnant of ages gone. It is *living* tradition. It is what gives to the East its Christian identity. It is what has kept its identity through ages of strife and temptation. I am not speaking now of Patristic opinions, but precisely of the Patristic mentality and attitude.

The Orthodox Church of the East has been speaking for centuries the same old idiom of the Fathers, has kept and cherished it as her true mother tongue, and for that reason is perhaps better equipped for its adequate interpretation than any one who would merely learn a foreign tongue in order to interpret ancient texts with some respectable dictionary in his hands. A native's command of his own language is ever the safest because it is spontaneous. The Eastern Church is still speaking Patristic Greek, a Greek that was in fact the only theological language of the Church universal for at least a thousand years, and she has been doing it faithfully for ages, at least in her worship, in the devotional and spiritual life of the faithful. Sometimes, especially in modern times, this language has been

discontinued or lost even in the East, so far as the school or class were concerned. There were some notable Western accretions in the modern theology of the East, and thereby a kind of divorce of the classroom from the chapel was established. It was a most uncomfortable and unfortunate feature, and there were many grave dangers implied therein. Yet the very fact of this divorce compelled Eastern theologians to be, or at least try to be, mentally bilingual, as it were, which implied a permanent mutual check on both the idioms involved. And therefore, as it has been recently suggested, Eastern theologians in our time are directly linked with the Fathers without ceasing to be modern and up-to-date. This is the opinion of Hans Ehrenberg, editor of *Östliches Christentum*, who, in speaking of the Eastern theologians, says, "they stand without intermediate connections upon the foundation of the ancient Fathers. With them we are again in the midst of an unbroken stream of living dogmatic thinking; this is not a dogmatism, but dogma itself, not an ecclesiasticism, but just the Church. Their theology is a true child of ancient Christianity, of the early Church, and an adoptive child of modern Europe." Dr. Ehrenberg was speaking primarily of modern Russian theology. But what he had to say does apply, to a great extent, to the Eastern Church as a whole.

III

Many Westerners still believe in the "Unchanging East" even in the Church, "unchanging" in the sense of sterility and stagnation. It is a very dangerous illusion and an obvious historical error. The point is that the Eastern Church has kept the undistorted heritage of the old in a vigorous discourse with the changing times (a German would say: *Auseinandersetzung*). Since the Fourth Crusade the Christian East never lost living contact with the West, and Western impact on Eastern development was considerable. The ancient tradition was kept in spite of pressure from abroad and not by inertia only. These contacts were often rather unhappy. Yet in this school of historical trial and conflict, the Eastern Church had to learn, and to a large extent did learn, to respond to modern challenges and problems out of the continuous experience in which the old and the new are merged into a living whole. By no means am I going to suggest that all problems have been happily solved and all tensions smoothed or removed. On the contrary, we are just in the midst of an acute tension and conflict. So was the Church in the glorious age of the Ecumenical Councils. I am concerned at the moment only with the right approach to these inevitable and recurrent tensions. We have to meet the challenge of the changing ages on the solid ground of an ecumenical and catholic tradition and experience. Or, in the phrase of F. D. Maurice, we have to check the spirit of our own age not by the spirit of any other particular age, but by the Holy Spirit of God.

It is precisely at this point that the main objection arises. When we recall the old tradition, the witness of Christian antiquity, are we not doing precisely what we are ourselves condemning and disavowing? Are we not simply imposing an obsolete mentality of bygone ages? It is true, indeed, that the Fathers both Greek and Latin were interpreting the Apostolic

and every reliable minister of the Word is expected to be able to check all the modern "translations" and interpretations, otherwise his interpretation would be inadequate. The same applies to dogma. In order to interpret the mind of the ancient Church, i.e., the mind of the Fathers, we have to be Patristically-minded ourselves. Otherwise, we would be in danger of inventing new meanings, instead of interpreting the old.

Is this suggestion that we learn the idiom of the ancient Church really ridiculous? Are there not in our time many who endeavour to learn the language of the great Reformers, to rediscover and regain it as their mother tongue and to use it, in the modern environment, for preaching and theological thinking? In fact there are not a few who do really speak the idiom of Luther and Calvin in our day, and do not mind being out of date for that. Just as there are many in the Church of Rome who use the idiom of St. Thomas. As a matter of fact in our troubled age almost every one is ambitious not to speak in theology a vulgar and debased contemporary idiom but to use something nobler and elaborate. Why should we not try to use the idiom of the Fathers? Why should the idiom of the fourth and fifth centuries be eliminated from the contemporary Tower of Babel? And possibly it is exactly on this ancient ground of the common tradition of all Christians that the divergent denominations of to-day might meet, if we take the risk to regain the true ecumenical vision of Church history and to overcome our various "provincialisms" of space and time. It is at this point that the Eastern Church can be of help.

(To be concluded.)

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD